

Rollins College Rollins Scholarship Online

Professional Standards Committee Minutes

College of Arts and Sciences Minutes and Reports

12-3-2009

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee Meeting, Thursday, December 3, 2009

Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ps

Recommended Citation

Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee, "Minutes, Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee Meeting, Thursday, December 3, 2009" (2009). *Professional Standards Committee Minutes*. Paper 78.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ps/78

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Arts and Sciences Minutes and Reports at Rollins Scholarship Online. It has been accepted for inclusion in Professional Standards Committee Minutes by an authorized administrator of Rollins Scholarship Online. For more information, please contact wzhang@rollins.edu.

Professional Standard Committee
Minutes—December 3, 2009
4:00 – 5:00 p.m.
Bush 105

The meeting was convened at 4 p.m. by Thomas Moore. Faculty members present were Joshua Almond, Erich Blossy, Marc Fetscherin, Emily Russell, Claire Strom and Anca Voicu. Student member Billy Kennedy, Dean Laurie Joyner, and Library Director Jonathan Miller were also present.

- 1) Announcements: L. Joyner is considering changing the due date of the FSAR from August to February and we asked, is this a strictly administrative decision or should it come through the committee or to the faculty? L. Joyner clarified that with this change the FSAR would cover the calendar year, not the academic year. We agreed that the committee does not need to weigh in on the matter.
- 2) Old Business
 - a. Open Access Journals (Strom): The committee and guest J. Miller had a wide-ranging and extended discussion about the specifics of the proposed open access policy. C. Strom provided the background that, like most current policies, our proposed guidelines are based on Harvard's policy, with some additions based on Stanford, MIT, Trinity. M. Fetscherin asked where the articles would be available. C. Strom explained that all faculty-authored articles would be available online and Google searchable. M. Fetscherin added the consideration that publishers in business often want to preserve a closed circle of limited distribution for copyright reasons. C. Strom replied that limited distribution would compromise the open access intent of the policy, but acknowledged that she shared concerns as a journal editor. She went on to note that copyright agreements can be altered by journals to accommodate this change and that open access reflects a contemporary shift in journal funding away from subscriber base; she added, however, that faculty members may simply submit a waiver to PSC for work published by journals who will not accept open access. J. Miller described how this practice by which a faculty member would submit an online waiver produced by Berkeley Electronic Press. C. Strom emphasized that the committee cannot deny the waiver; we're just collecting data. J. Miller added that in cases where the publisher won't agree to open access, but Rollins library has access to the journal through other databases, a password-protected link will be available. J. Miller further clarified that the manuscript version will typically be made available, but some journals may offer final paginated version. We agreed that different fields will be more or less open to the policy. C. Strom also explained that we will accommodate journal policies that might want to hold exclusive rights to print copies for a specific timeframe. J. Miller described the benefits of open access, emphasizing that this practice has brought more readers to both individual articles and to journals as documented by increased citations. M. Fetscherin asked, What about internal copyright law? J. Miller responded that the language of "US copyright law" in the policy is specific to the license granted to Rollins as a US-

based institution. M. Fetscherin then asked, is the policy limited to A&S, or is there a similar initiative in Crummer? And, is five years too long to assess the pilot? E. Blossey and C. Strom agreed that two years might be more appropriate and will change the policy to reflect this suggestion. C. Strom also noted that the explanations used by faculty on waivers would be most useful in assessing the policy. J. Miller explained that he hasn't yet approached Crummer, but proposed to use A&S as a pilot, recognizing that, as noted by M. Fetscherin, business as a field might be slower to adopt these changes. L. Joyner asked about the application of the policy to faculty with joint appointments or with multiple authors. J. Miller replied that any individual author has control over the total work; in the case of multiple authors, open access policy would still apply.

Next steps: T. Moore takes the policy to Executive Committee, then C. Strom will act as floor manager for the proposal at a faculty meeting. J. Miller offered that other successful schools have encouraged circulating an FAQ and discussing the policy in open meetings; is a colloquium appropriate? L. Joyner noted that department chairs meetings are a great forum to spark discussion.

Miller emphasized the need for transparency regarding the following line: "To this end, the faculty authorize appropriate Olin Library personnel to have access to the information recorded in Section II(1) 'Research, Scholarship, and Artistic Activity' of the College of Arts & Sciences Faculty Self-Assessment Reports." L. Joyner agreed that it is essential to be transparent with faculty regarding release of information perceived as personnel or review info. She continued that the new FSAR database is set up so that different sections can be broken out and released as appropriate. M. Fetscherin suggested a language change from "personnel to have access" to "dean's office will release."

E. Blossey moved for approval of the policy pending changes described above (see attached draft dated 12/08), B. Kennedy seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

- b. The committee considered a request by H. Kypraios to appear before the committee: T. Moore believes it would not be collegial to refuse him the opportunity to make his case or ask questions. C. Strom asked, does this audience open a precedent for appeals to grant decisions? A. Voicu replied that in his appeal, H. Kypraios should present new information. C. Strom asked, should we have criteria for when an appeal is appropriate? L. Joyner encouraged the committee to establish parameters for the discussion, including time limit. M. Fetscherin suggested a two step approach in order to provide structure to the process, write a letter as the first step. T. Moore will contact H. Kypraios inviting him to submit his concerns in writing and then we will invite him to the meeting. A. Voicu noted that our rigorous enforcement of posted guidelines will include a painful transition period.
- c. Update on blended learning: AAC has been meeting with people from Holt and IT to continue the discussion. PSC is waiting for the conclusion of these discussions and a nod from AAC before reviewing proposals. We asked, whether there is a plan for assessment of blended learning courses and this initiative? And, where

are the voices of faculty and the dean of faculty in these questions of curricular development? T. Moore suggested we preserve our motion tabling the decision pending expression of support from AAC. C. Strom asked, what does it mean to initiate a change in our pedagogical model in a college where we pride ourselves on student contact? And who owns the intellectual property of the course design? L. Joyner replied that to her knowledge, AAC has not raised the copyright concerns. M. Fetscherin noted that Crummer has passed blended learning. He also asked, how do people define blended learning, noting that disciplinary distinctions will factor into these definitions. He wondered, is blended learning a radical change? C. Strom allowed that the change may or may not be radical, but argued that the faculty needs to discuss the proposal. T. Moore notes that the call for proposals listed IT as the group assessing the courses; this plan will need to be changed before PSC can approve proposals.

- d. Evaluation of teaching (Blossey/Strom)

3) New Business

- a. CIE for Holt and graduate classes
- b. Guidance on materials for tenure and promotion
- c. Course load equation
- d. Grade inflation
- e. Criteria for sabbatical
- f. FEC bylaw changes
- g. Student-Faculty Collaborative Scholarship Program
- h. Changing the grant approval process

Respectfully submitted by Emily Russell.

Attachments (1)

OPEN ACCESS POLICY

The faculty of Arts & Sciences of Rollins College is committed to disseminating the fruits of its research and scholarship as widely as possible. In keeping with that commitment, the faculty adopts the following policy: Each member of the faculty of Arts & Sciences grants to Rollins College nonexclusive permission to make available the final, peer-reviewed, manuscript version accepted for publication of his or her scholarly articles (hereafter referred to as "works") and to exercise all rights under United States copyright law in those works for the purpose of open dissemination. In legal terms, each faculty member grants to Rollins College a nonexclusive, irrevocable, paid-up, non-commercial, worldwide license to exercise any and all rights under copyright relating to each of his or her scholarly works, in any medium, provided that the works are not sold for a profit or used for any commercial purposes, and to authorize others to do the same. The policy will apply to all peer-reviewed scholarly works, including works jointly authored with persons who are not members of the Rollins faculty of Arts & Sciences, written while the person is a member of the faculty except for any works completed before the adoption of this policy and any works for which the faculty member entered into an incompatible licensing or assignment agreement before the adoption of this policy. The Professional Standards Committee will waive application of the policy for a particular work upon written notification by the author, who informs Professional Standards Committee of the reason.

To assist Rollins College in distributing the scholarly works, on or before the date of publication, each faculty member will make available an electronic copy of his or her final version of the work at no charge to a designated representative of Olin Library in appropriate formats (such as Microsoft Word or PDF) specified by the library. Each work will be embargoed until it has appeared either in print or online at the publisher's web site, whichever comes first.

Olin Library will make the works available to the public in an open-access repository. The Professional Standards Committee will be responsible for interpreting this policy, resolving disputes concerning its interpretation and application, and recommending changes to the faculty. The policy is to take effect immediately; it will be reviewed after two years by the Professional Standards Committee, with a report presented to the faculty.

The faculty of Arts & Sciences calls upon Olin Library to develop and monitor a plan for a service or mechanism that would render compliance with the policy and the waiver procedure as convenient for the faculty as possible. To this end, the faculty authorize the Dean of the Faculty to provide appropriate Olin Library personnel with the information recorded in Section II(1) "Research, Scholarship, and Artistic Activity" of the College of Arts & Sciences Faculty Self-Assessment Reports.

Draft 12/08/09

Based largely on policies of Harvard, MIT, Stanford, and Trinity College

